

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 24 are currently pending in the application.

This amendment is in response to the Office Action of January 22, 2008.

35 U.S.C. § 112 Claim Rejections

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention.

During examination the USPTO must give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 367 F.3d 1359, 70 USPQ2d 1827 (Fed Cir. 2004) This means that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification. Ordinary, simple English words whose meaning is clear and unquestionable, absent any indication that their use in a particular context changes their meaning, are construed to mean exactly what they say. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 13 USPQ2d 1320 (Fed. Cir. 1989) *Chef Amernica Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 1371, 69 USPQ2d 1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004) The ordinary and customary meaning of a claim term is the meaning the that the term would have to a person of ordinary skill in the art in question at the time of the invention, *i.e.*, as of the effective date of the patent application. *Phillips v. AWH Corp.*, 415 F.3d 1303, 74 USPQ2d 1321 (Fed. Cir. 2005). (*en banc*); *Sunrace Roots Enter. Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 67 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Brookhill-Wilk 1, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.* 334 F.3d 1294, 67 USPQ2d 1132 (Fe. Cir. 2003) In the absence of an express intent to impart a novel meaning to the claim terms, the words are presumed to take on the ordinary and customary meanings attributed to them by those of ordinary skill in the art. It is the use of the words in the context of the written description and customarily by those skilled in the relevant art that accurately reflects both the “ordinary” and the “customary” meaning of the terms in the claims. *Fergusson Beauregard/Logic Controls v. Mega Systems*, 350 F.3d 1327, 69 USPQ2D 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2003) MPEP § 2111, MPEP § 2111.01

Applicants assert that the word “property” has the ordinary, simple, customary meaning of the word “property” as set forth in Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary, page 943, and as used in the Applicants specification, numbered paragraphs [0015] through [0018] and [0028] through [0054]. A copy of the ordinary, simple, customary meaning of the word “property” as set forth on page 943 of Webster’s Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary is attached to this amendment as Attachment A for the Examiner’s reference.

Applicants assert that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 clearly set forth the scope of the “properties” of the first adhesive layer and the second adhesive layer.

In independent claim 1, Applicants assert that the multilayer adhesive includes a first outermost adhesive layer having “properties” of a “first outermost adhesive layer are set forth as “the a first outermost adhesive layer comprising a mixture of electromagnetic radiation-curable components having properties of a first type, the electromagnetic radiation-curable components having properties of a first type comprising a first outermost adhesive layer providing a laser-markable surface upon exposure to an electromagnetic radiation source by curing and bonding to at least a portion of a semiconductor device forming a mark on the semiconductor device by the electromagnetic radiation- curable components curing and remaining on the semiconductor device when a laser marks a semiconductor device” while the “properties” of the second adhesive layer are set forth as “a second adhesive layer separate from the first outermost adhesive layer having second properties different than the properties of the first type of the first outermost adhesive layer disposed between the tape and the first outermost adhesive layer, the second adhesive layer having second properties comprising a second adhesive layer of a mixture of electromagnetic radiation-curable components upon exposing to radiation the second adhesive layer facilitating peeling of a flexible film material when laser marking a semiconductor device”.

In independent claim 9, Applicants assert that the multilayer adhesive including a first outermost adhesive layer having “properties” of “a first outermost adhesive layer comprising a mixture of electromagnetic radiation-curable components having properties of a first type comprising a first outermost adhesive layer providing a mark on a laser-markable surface upon exposure thereof to electromagnetic radiation by curing and bonding to at least a portion of a semiconductor device by the electromagnetic radiation- curable components curing and

remaining on the semiconductor device when a laser marks a semiconductor device” while the properties of the a second adhesive layer are set for the as a “second adhesive layer separate from the first outermost adhesive layer having second properties different than the properties of the first type of the first outermost adhesive layer disposed between the film material and the first outermost adhesive layer, the second adhesive layer having second properties comprising a second adhesive layer of a mixture of electromagnetic radiation-curable components upon exposing to radiation the second adhesive layer solely facilitating peeling of a flexible film material when laser marking a semiconductor device”.

In independent claim 17, Applicants assert that the at least two layers of adhesive including a first outermost adhesive layer having “properties” of “a first outermost adhesive layer comprising a mixture of electromagnetic radiation-curable components having properties of a first type comprising a first outermost adhesive layer providing a mark on a surface upon exposure thereof to electromagnetic radiation by curing and bonding to at least a portion of a semiconductor device, the radiation-curable components forming the mark by curing and bonding to a surface of the semiconductor device when a laser marks a semiconductor device” while the second adhesive layer has “properties” of a “a second adhesive layer separate from the first outermost adhesive layer having second properties different than the properties of the first type of the first outermost adhesive layer disposed between the film material and the first outermost adhesive layer, the second adhesive layer having second properties comprising a second adhesive layer of a mixture of electromagnetic radiation-curable components upon exposing to radiation the second adhesive layer solely facilitating peeling of a flexible film material when laser marking a semiconductor device”.

Applicants assert that Applicant asserts that, at least, specification paragraphs numbered [0041] and [0049] clearly supports the claim limitation of presently amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 calling for “first mixture layer is formed of a type so as to cure and bond to a surface of a bare semiconductor die 20 upon exposure to a radiation source, whereupon it is laser markable” and “[u]pon exposure to radiation, the second adhesive layer can either cure onto the first mixture layer or, alternatively, lose its adhesive properties and facilitate peeling of carrier tape 4 from a wafer or surface of a bare semiconductor die 20”.

Applicants assert that when the words of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 are given their ordinary, simple, customary meanings, there is nothing vague and indefinite about such claim terminology under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Further, Applicants assert that the ordinary, simple, customary meanings of the word “property” does not require a “chemical” definition of any different “properties” of the either the first outermost adhesive layer or the second adhesive layer. Applicants assert that both the claim language of the claimed inventions of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 and the specification of such claim language is definite under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Therefore, presently amended claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, AND 24 are allowable under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections

Obviousness Rejection Based on Weng et al. (U.S. Patent 5,972,234) in view of Ishiwata et al. (U.S. Patent 5,300,172)

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weng et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,972,234) in view of Ishiwata et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,300,172). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Applicants further submit that to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the cited prior art reference must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. Furthermore, the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicants’ disclosure.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness the prior art reference (or references when combined) **must teach or suggest all the claim limitations**. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 985 (CCPA 1974); *see also* MPEP § 2143.03. Additionally, the Examiner must determine whether

there is “an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed by the patent at issue.” *KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1740-1741, 167 L.Ed.2d 705, 75 USLW 4289, 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1385 (2007). Further, rejections on obviousness grounds “cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.” *Id* at 1741, quoting *In re Kahn*, 441, F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006). Finally, to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness there must be a reasonable expectation of success. *In re Merck & Co., Inc.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 1097 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Furthermore, the reason that would have prompted the combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself, and not based on the Applicant’s disclosure. *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C. H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2006); MPEP § 2144. Underlying the obvious determination is the fact that statutorily prohibited hindsight cannot be used. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1742; *DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1367.

Turning to the cited prior art, Weng et al. teaches or suggests a method for marking a semiconductor surface. Weng et al. describe a polymeric tape can be provided that is suitable for ablative photodecomposition. Column 4 lines 25-40. In other words, the mark which is to be formed in the semiconductor surface is first formed as a cavity through the tape using “high-intensity energy beams such as ultraviolet light or laser.” Column 4 lines 32-33; *See also* column 2 lines 63-63, column 3 lines 6-11, column 3 lines 22-23, column 3 lines 27-30, column 3 lines 39-40, column 4 lines 52-54. After the mark has been formed *through* the tape, the tape is applied to the semiconductor surface. Column 4 line 57 – column 5 line 7. Finally, the mark is formed in the semiconductor surface by etching the semiconductor in the area exposed by the mark formed in the tape. The tape protects the rest of the semiconductor surface from the etchant, such that the mark in the tape is patterned into the semiconductor surface. Column 5 lines 8-25. Finally, the tape is removed from the surface of the semiconductor, leaving the mark formed by the etchant. Column 5 lines 27 – 37. The tape has a thickness of about 0.5 mm and can be provided with an adhesive backing or without an adhesive backing. Column 5, lines 38-41. A suitable adhesive may be an acrylic type polymer. Column 4, lines 63,64. Weng et al. does not teach or suggest forming a mark on a semiconductor surface using an ultraviolet light or

laser to cause adhesive of the tape to cure and bond to the semiconductor surface forming a mark thereon as only an etching process forms a mark on the semiconductor surface.

The Ishiwata et al. reference teaches or suggests the use of a radiation curable adhesive tape on a wafer to form a three dimensional network.

Applicants assert that any combination of the Weng et al. reference in view of the Ishiwata et al. reference fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed inventions of presently amended independent claims 1, 9, and 17 because cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations and the suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success is found solely in Applicants' disclosure, not the cited prior art.

Applicants assert that any combination of the cited prior art does not and cannot establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 regarding the claimed inventions of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 because any such combination of the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the claimed inventions.

Applicants assert that the ordinary, simple, customary meaning of the words of the claims must be used to interpret the claimed inventions. Applicants assert that the ordinary, simple, customary meaning of such words cannot be changed to an unordinary, unusual, unused meaning of the words in any rejection without a showing that such is used by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicants note that the Office Action states that "Weng lacks teaching that the marking tape comprises 1) a material having a thermal expansion coefficient substantially similar to the semiconductor device, 2) two different adhesive layers, and 3) the first outermost adhesive layer is radiation curable and bonded to at least a portion of a semiconductor device." Applicants further note that the Office Action asserts that "... since Weng teaches a marking tape having substantially the same structure [but not the same] and composition for the same use as the instant invention, selecting a workable material having a similar thermal expansion coefficient substantially similar to the semiconductor device is deemed to be an obvious routine optimization, dictated by the same use conditions."

However, there is no showing in the cited prior art in the application to support any such statements by one of ordinary skill in the art under 35 U.S.C. § 103 to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as Applicants assert that such statements are “mere conclusory statements without some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness.”

Further, Applicants assert that there is no mandatory requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 103 that the first outermost adhesive layer and the second adhesive layer be claimed using chemical equations and structure and can only be claimed by using chemical equations and structure to show specific chemistry variations in the first outermost adhesive layer and the second adhesive layer so that they are distinguished from each other as they are distinguished from each other, rather than being distinguished from each other by the “properties” set forth in the claimed inventions of independent claims 1, 9, and 17. Applicants assert that there has been and can be no showing that the chemical structure of the first outermost adhesive layer and the second adhesive layer must be set forth in the claimed inventions of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 under either 35 U.S.C. § 102 or 35 U.S.C. § 103 to distinguish over cited prior art when the “properties” of such layers distinguish over the cited prior art. Applicants can find no basis in 35 U.S.C. or 37 CFR or the MPEP for any requirement of using chemical equations and structure solely to distinguish over cited prior art.

While the Office Action takes the position that “a single thicker adhesive layer would clearly read on the disclosed chemistry between the two layers”, Applicants disagree with such an assertion as there has been no showing as such and Applicants assert that such a statement clearly does not comply with the different ordinary, simple, customary meaning of the word “property” or “properties” of the first outermost adhesive layer and the second adhesive layer set forth in independent claims 1, 9, and 17 which clearly distinguish between the properties of the adhesives and clearly require that two layers of adhesive be present, not a single layer. While the Office Action states that the “examiner takes the position that since Weng’s single-layer adhesive provides the same structural features at its outer surfaces and the recitation lacks any distinct chemistry

between the two adhesive layers, Weng's single layered adhesive marking tape reads on the two adhesive layers of the claimed invention", Applicants assert that there has been no showing that one of ordinary skill in the art would take such a position and such statement is merely a conclusory statement without some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning for support from the cited prior art.

Further, Applicants assert that since the cited prior art fails to teach or suggest the claim limitations of the claimed inventions of independent claims 1, 9, and 17 and since there has been no showing that one of ordinary skill in the art based on the cited prior art would consider the claim limitations to be obvious based on any teachings of any prior art, the rejection of claimed 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 1,., 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24 based on any combination of the Weng et al. reference in view of the Ishiwata et al. reference is a hindsight reconstruction of the claimed inventions base solely upon Applicants' disclosure which is *impermissible*. Applicants note that the reason that would have prompted the combination and the reasonable expectation of success must be found in the prior art, common knowledge, or the nature of the problem itself, and not based on the Applicant's disclosure. *DyStar Textilfarben GmbH & Co. Deutschland KG v. C. H. Patrick Co.*, 464 F.3d 1356, 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2006); MPEP § 2144. Applicants assert that there has been no such showing. Additionally, underlying the obvious determination is the fact that statutorily prohibited hindsight cannot be used. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1742; *DyStar*, 464 F.3d at 1367. Applicants assert that all and any hindsight is prohibited and cannot be used regarding any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as the *KSR* decision clearly overrules the earlier *In re McLaughlin* case. Applicants assert that there has been no showing of success for any combination of the Weng et al. reference in view of the Ishiwata et al. reference whatsoever. Applicants further assert that there is no reason set forth to modify the Weng et al. reference in view of the Ishiwata et al. reference, other than Applicants disclosure. Applicants further assert that since neither the Weng et al. reference nor the Ishiwata et al. reference nor any combination of the Weng et al. reference in view of the Ishiwata et al. reference teaches or suggests all the claim limitations of independent claims 1, 9, and 17, such claims are rejected based solely on hindsight based solely on Applicants disclosure which is *impermissible*.

Therefore, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24 are allowable.

Applicants request the allowance of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, and 24 and the case passed for issue.

Respectfully submitted,



James R. Duzan
Registration No. 28,393
Attorney for Applicants
TRASKBRITT
P.O. Box 2550
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: March 28, 2008
JRD/djp:lmh
Document in ProLaw

ATTACHMENT A



WEBSTER'S

Ninth New
Collegiate
Dictionary

A Merriam-Webster®

MERRIAM-WEBSTER INC., Publishers
Springfield, Massachusetts, U.S.A.



A GENUINE MERRIAM-WEBSTER

The name *Webster* alone is no guarantee of excellence. It is used by a number of publishers and may serve mainly to mislead an unwary buyer.

A *Merriam-Webster*® is the registered trademark you should look for when you consider the purchase of dictionaries or other fine reference books. It carries the reputation of a company that has been publishing since 1831 and is your assurance of quality and authority.

Copyright © 1989 by Merriam-Webster Inc.

Philippines Copyright 1989 by Merriam-Webster Inc.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Main entry under title:

Webster's ninth new collegiate dictionary.

Includes index.

I. English language—Dictionaries. I. Merriam-Webster Inc.

PE1628.W5638 1989 423 88-8335

ISBN 0-87779-508-8

ISBN 0-87779-509-6 (indexed)

ISBN 0-87779-510-X (deluxe)

Webster's Ninth New Collegiate Dictionary principal copyright 1983

COLLEGIATE trademark Reg. U.S. Pat. Off.

All rights reserved. No part of this book covered by the copyrights hereon may be reproduced or copied in any form or by any means—graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including photocopying, taping, or information storage and retrieval systems—without written permission of the publisher.

Made in the United States of America

3132333435RMcn89

PROOFREADERS' MARKS

(27) : strongly marked : DECIDED —
 -naun(t)s-tle^v *adv*
 ant\ n (1593) 1 : a usu. formal de-
 clarative announcement
 g to or indicating pronunciation (a ~

promptus prompt] (ca. 1740) : without

-kya-lar\ *adj* [pro- + nuclear] (ca.
 ling a pronucleus
 (1971) : advocating the use of nuclear

\ n [NL] (1880) : the haploid nucleus
 egg or sperm) up to the time of fusion
 fertilization

-ment-(-) *n*, pl -tos or -toes [Sp
 o pronunciation, fr. L. pronuntiare] (1833)
 n

-shon also -naun(t)-\ n [ME pro-
 fr. L. pronuntiation-, pronuntiatio, fr.
] (15c) : the act or manner of pro-
 nouncing

-tional\ -shnol- -shan-\ *adj*
 prove, fr. OF *preuve*, fr. LL *proba*, fr. L.
] (13c) 1 : a : the cogency of evi-
 dence the mind of a truth or a fact b : the

hing the validity of a statement esp. by
 s in accordance with principles of rea-
 soning : something that induces certainty or

the quality or state of having been
 : hardness 5 : evidence operating to
 sent of a tribunal 6 : a pl proofs or

made for examination or correction
 ving, etching, or lithograph c : a coin
 shed die on a polished planchet, is not

retimes differs in metallic content from
 or circulation d : a test photographic
 a test applied to articles or substances

standard or satisfactory quality 8 : a
 th of proof spirit b : strength with
 roof spirit; specif : alcoholic strength

twice the percent by volume of alcohol
 alcohol

ist or repel (makes literature somehow
 Jonathan Miller) — often used in com-
 in proving or testing or as a standard

strength or quality or alcoholic content
 or take a proof or test of b : PROOF-
 dity to 3 : to activate (yeast) by mix-
 gar or milk — *proof-er* *n*

resembling a proof coin esp. because
 \-fred\; -read-ing [back-formation fr
 mark corrections in (as a proof)
 : one that proofreads

(1903) : a room in which proofread-

olic liquor or mixture of ethanol and
 by volume at 60°F

FD, stopper; akin to MLG *proppe* stop-
 or sustains : SUPPORT

1) 1 a : to support by placing some-
 with up b : to support by placing
 STRENGTHEN

onic (acid)] : related to propionic acid

\ n [Gk *propaedeutē* to teach before-
 n to teach, fr. *paid-*, *país* child — more
 ry study or instruction — *propaedeutic*

prō-pa-\ n [NL, fr. *Congregatio de pro-*
propaganda the faith, organization
 V +1623] (1718) 1 *cap* : a congrega-
 jurisdiction over missionary territories

re spreading of ideas, information, or
 g or injuring an institution, a cause, or
 legations spread deliberately to further

opposing cause; also : a public action
 gan-dist \-dost\ *n* or *adj* — *prop-a-gan-*

lized; -diz-ing *v* (1844) : to subject to
 propaganda for ~ *vi* : to carry on pro-
 di-zar\ *n*

ed; -gat-ing [L. *propagatus*, pp. of *propa-*
propagare slip, offspring, fr. *pro-* before +
 O. FACT] *v* (ca. 1570) 1 : to cause to

or asexual reproduction 2 : to pass
 use to spread out and affect a greater
 D b : to foster growing knowledge of

of (as an idea or belief) : PUBLICIZE c
 through a medium ~ *v* 1 : to multi-
 INCREASE, EXTEND 3 : to travel through

wave energy (as light, sound, or radio
 -ga-bal\ *adj* — *prop-a-ga-tive* \-gat-iv\

n (15c) : the act or action of propagat-
 ing of organism) in numbers b : the
 chief) abroad or into new regions : DIS-
 or extension (as of a crack) in a solid

or δ or γ delete; take out

close up; print as one word

delete and close up

or \succ or \wedge caret; insert here (something)

insert space

eg# space evenly \wedge where indicated

stet let marked text stand as set

tr transpose; change (order) the

/ used to separate two or more marks
 and often as a concluding stroke at
 the end of an insertion

L set farther to the left

] set farther to the right

set \ae or \fl as ligatures \ae or \fl

= straighten alignment

// straighten or align

X imperfect or broken character

□ indent or insert em quad space

¶ begin a new paragraph

(SP) spell out (set 5 lbs) as five pounds

cap set in capitals (CAPITALS)

sm cap or s.c. set in small capitals (SMALL CAPITALS)

lc set in lowercase (lowercase)

ital set in italic (italic)

rom set in roman (roman)

bf set in boldface (boldface)

= or -/ or $\hat{=}$ or /M/ hyphen

$\frac{1}{N}$ or $\frac{1}{EN}$ or /N/ en dash (1965-72)

$\frac{1}{M}$ or $\frac{1}{EM}$ or /M/ em — or long — dash

✓ superscript or superior (3^{as} in πr^2)

^ subscript or inferior (2_{as} in H₂O)

or X centered for a centered dot in p · q)

comma

apostrophe

period

; or j/ semicolon

: or @ colon

or quotation marks

(/) parentheses

[/] brackets

OK/? query to author: has this been set as
 intended?

↓ or 1 push down a work-up

turn over an inverted letter

wf¹ wrong font; a character of the wrong
 size or esp. style

¹ The last three symbols are unlikely to be needed in marking
 proofs of photocomposed matter.

prop-a-gule \ˈprāp-ə-gyū(ə)\ n [NL. *propagulum*, fr. L. *propages* slip]
 (1858) : a structure (as a cutting, a seed, or a spore) that propagates a
 plant

pro-pane \ˈprō-pān\ n [ISV *prop-* + -ane] (1866) : a heavy flammable
 gaseous paraffin hydrocarbon C₃H₈ found in crude petroleum and
 natural gas and used esp. as fuel and in chemical synthesis

prop-el \ˈprō-pel\ v *propelled*; *propelling* [ME *propellen*, fr. L. *propel-*
lere, fr. *pro-* before + *pellere* to drive — more at FELT] (15c) : to drive
 forward or onward by or as if by means of a force that imparts motion
syn see PUSH

prop-el-lant or prop-el-lent \ˈpel-ənt\ *adj* (1644) : capable of propelling
propellant also *propellent* n (1814) : something that propels as a : an
 explosive for propelling projectiles b : fuel plus oxidizer used by a
 rocket engine c : a gas in a pressure bottle for expelling the contents
 when the pressure is released

prop-el-der also prop-el-lor \ˈprō-pel-ər\ n (1780) 1 : one that propels
 2 : a device that consists of a central hub with radiating blades placed
 and twisted so that each forms part of a helical surface and that is used
 to propel a vehicle (as a ship or airplane)

prop-ent \ˈprō-pend\ v [L. *propendere*, fr. *pro-* before + *pendere* to hang
 — more at PENDANT] obs (1545) : INCLINE

prop-ense \ˈprō-pen(t)s\ *adj* [L. *propensus*, pp. of *propendere*] archaic
 (1528) : leaning or inclining toward : DISPOSED

prop-en-sity \ˈprō-pen(t)-sə-tē\ n, pl -ties (1570) : an often intense natu-
 ral inclination or preference *syn* see LEARNING

prop-er \ˈprāp-ər\ *adj* [ME *propre* proper, own, fr. MF, fr. L. *proprius*
 own] (13c) 1 a : referring to one individual only b : belonging to
 one : OWN c : appointed for the liturgy of a particular day d : repre-
 sented hereditarily in natural color 2 : belonging characteristically to
 a species or individual : PECULIAR 3 chiefly dial : BECOMING, HANDSOME

4 : very good : EXCELLENT 5 chiefly Brit : UTTER, ABSOLUTE 6
 : strictly limited to a specified thing, place, or idea (the city ~) 7 a
 : strictly accurate : CORRECT b archaic : VIRTUOUS, RESPECTABLE c
 : strictly decorous : GENTLE 8 : marked by suitability, rightness, or
 appropriateness : FIT 9 : being a mathematical subset (as a subgroup)

that does not contain all the elements of the inclusive set from which it
 is derived *syn* see FIT — *properly* *adv* — *proper-ness* *n*

proper n (15c) 1 : the parts of the Mass that vary according to the
 liturgical calendar 2 : the part of a missal or breviary containing the
 proper of the Mass and the offices proper to the holy days of the litur-
 gical year

proper *adv*, chiefly dial (15c) : in a thorough manner : COMPLETELY

proper adjective n (1905) : an adjective that is formed from a proper
 noun and that is usu. capitalized in English

prop-er-din \ˈprō-pərd-ən\ n [prob. fr. *pro-* + L. *perdere* to destroy + E
 -in — more at PERDITION] (1954) : a serum protein that participates in
 destruction of bacteria, neutralization of viruses, and lysis of red blood
 cells

proper fraction n (1674) : a fraction in which the numerator is less or of
 lower degree than the denominator

proper noun n (ca. 1890) : a noun that designates a particular being or
 thing, does not take a limiting modifier, and is usu. capitalized in En-
 glish — called also *proper name*

prop-er-tied \ˈprāp-ər-tēd\ *adj* (1760) : possessing property

prop-er-ty \ˈprāp-ər-tē\ n, pl -ties [ME *proprieté*, fr. MF *propreté*, fr. L.
proprietas, fr. *proprius* own] (14c) 1 a : a quality or trait
 belonging and esp. peculiar to an individual or thing b : an effect that
 an object has on another object or on the senses c : VIRTUE 3 d : an
 attribute common to all members of a class 2 a : something owned
 or possessed; specif : a piece of real estate b : the exclusive right to
 possess, enjoy, and dispose of a thing : OWNERSHIP c : something to
 which a person has a legal title d : one (as a performer) under con-
 tract whose work is esp. valuable 3 : an article or object used in a
 play or motion picture except painted scenery and costumes *syn* see
 QUALITY — *property-less* \-ləs\ *adj*

property damage insurance n (ca. 1946) : insurance protecting against
 all or part of an individual's legal liability for damage done (as by his
 or her automobile) to the property of another

property right n (1903) : a legal right or interest in or against specific
 property

property tax n (1808) : a tax levied on real or personal property

prop-hage \ˈprō-faj-, -fajz\ n (1951) : an intracellular form of a bacte-
 riophage in which it is harmless to the host, is usu. integrated into the
 hereditary material of the host, and reproduces when the host does

prop-hase \ˈfajz\ n [ISV] (1884) 1 : the initial phase of mitosis in which
 chromosomes are condensed from the resting form and split into
 paired chromatids 2 : the initial stage of meiosis in which the chro-
 mosomes become visible, homologous pairs of chromosomes undergo
 synapsis and become shortened and thickened, individual chromo-
 somes become visibly double as paired chromatids, chiasmata occur,
 and the nuclear membrane disappears — compare DIAKINESIS, DIPLO-
 TENE, LEPTOTENE, PACHYTENE, ZYGOTENE — *pro-phasic* \ˈprō-fa-zik\

adj

prop-he-cy also prop-he-sy \ˈprāf-ə-sē\ n, pl -cies also -sies [ME *prophe-*
cie, fr. OF, fr. LL *prophetia*, fr. Gk *prophēteia*, fr. *prophētēs* prophet]
 (13c) 1 : the function or vocation of a prophet; specif : the inspired
 declaration of divine will and purpose 2 : an inspired utterance of a
 prophet 3 : a prediction of something to come

prop-he-sy \ˈprāf-ə-sē\ v *-sied*; *-sying* [ME *prophesien*, fr. MF *prophe-*
sier, fr. OF, fr. *prophécie* *vi* (14c) 1 : to utter by or as if by divine
 inspiration 2 : to predict with assurance or on the basis of mystic
 knowledge 3 : PREFIGURE ~ *vi* 1 : to speak as if divinely inspired 2
 : to give instruction in religious matters : PREACH 3 : to make a pre-
 diction *syn* see FORETELL — *prophe-sier* \-sē-ər\ *n*

prophet \ˈprāf-ət\ n [ME *prophete*, fr. OF, fr. L. *propheta*, fr. Gk
prophētēs, fr. *pro* for + *phanaí* to speak — more at FOR-BAN] (12c) 1
 : one who utters divinely inspired revelations; specif, often *cap* : the

\ə\ about \ə\ kitten, F table \ər\ further \ə\ ash \ə\ ace \ə\ cot, cart

\ə\ out \ə\ chin \ə\ bet \ə\ easy \ə\ go \ə\ hit \ə\ ice \ə\ job

\ə\ sing \ə\ go \ə\ law \ə\ boy \ə\ thin \ə\ the \ə\ foot \ə\ foot

\ə\ yet \ə\ vision \ə\ k, e, o, æ, æ, æ, æ, see Guide to Pronunciation